



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,242	08/21/2003	Matthias Helmstetter	TRW(ASG)6703	7537
7590	01/19/2006			EXAMINER ILAN, RUTH
TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL, TUMMINO & SZABO L.L.P. 1111 LEADER BLDG. 526 SUPERIOR AVENUE CLEVELAND, OH 44114-1400			ART UNIT 3616	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/645,242	HELMSTETTER ET AL.
	Examiner Ruth Ilan	Art Unit 3616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2005 and 14 October 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL.                                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-11, 13 and 14 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 13 and 14 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1, 2 and 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sutherland et al. (US 6,250,665) in view of Seidl et al. (US 5,199,834) and Loudin et al. (US 4,263,833). Sutherland et al. discloses a gas bag module comprising: a reaction plate 28 supporting a gas generator 12; a plastic retainer 70 (see column 4, lines 20-21) having cylindrical extensions 64 extending through openings 74 in a gas bag 14 and openings 76 in the reaction plate 28; and screws 66 received in the cylindrical extensions 64.

Sutherland et al. lacks drive screws, and extensions with axial slits, detent shoulders and internal beads. Seidl et al. teaches a gas bag module having components secured together by a drive screw 20 (see column 6, line 52 to column 7, line 16). Loudin et al. teaches a drive screw 16 that is driven into a retainer 12. The retainer 12 has a cylindrical extension 14 with axial slits 30, detent shoulders 46 and internal beads (see Fig. 6A). From these teachings of Seidl et al. and Loudin et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sutherland et al. by replacing the screws with drive screws in order to simplify and speed up assembly. Further, it would have been obvious to modify Sutherland et al. by providing the extensions with axial slits, detent shoulders and internal beads, as taught by Loudin et al., in order to increase the strength of the connection.

3. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sutherland et al. in view of Seidl et al. and Loudin et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Davis et al. (EP 709259). The Sutherland et al., Seidl et al. and Loudin et al. combination lacks a reaction plate made of plastic. Davis et al. teaches that module elements may be made of plastic or aluminum (see column 2, lines 5-6). From

this teaching of Davis et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Sutherland et al. by forming the reaction plate of plastic in order to reduce its weight.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claims 13 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed 9/16/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, except with regard to Davis, and as such the Davis rejection has not been continued. The following remarks are directed to Applicant's arguments beginning on the bottom of page 6 of the remarks section of the correspondence of September 16/2005. Applicant argues that none of the references alone or in combination teach all of the features of claim 1 or 11. It is noted that the Examiner has mapped, in the rejection above, all of the features recited in the claims. Additionally, the Applicant has not pointed out which limitations are missing.

6. Regarding the motivation to modify Sutherland in view of the teaching of Seidl et al., and Loudin: Seidl is relied on for the general teaching of using a drive screw in an air bag environment. Loudin is relied on for the particulars of the drive screw. The motivation for using a drive screw is found directly in Seidl et al., as noted above, the drive connection is quick, and additionally avoids stripping the threads. Loudin teaches a particular example of a drive screw connection that has the claimed features. The

benefits of the Loudin drive screw connection are that it is strong, and doesn't wipe the threads (see col. 1, lines 49-col. 2, lines 48.)

***Conclusion***

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ruth Ilan whose telephone number is 571-272-6673. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Dickson can be reached on 571-272-6669. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ruth Ilan  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3616

RI  
1/17/05

  
1/17/05